



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Vb

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,870	05/23/2006	Haifeng Hu	N338.312-0003	7306
164	7590	05/31/2007	EXAMINER	
KINNEY & LANGE, P.A. THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING 312 SOUTH THIRD STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55415-1002			YUN, JURIE	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2882				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/31/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/580,870	HU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jurie Yun	2882

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 9-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9 and 15-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 10-14 and 19-21 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/18/06.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The preliminary amendment filed 5/23/06 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 14, there is lack of antecedence for "the detectors provided in the vertical upright arm". Appropriate correction is required.

3. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 9 should be amended to clarify the location of the calibrator and collimator. As written, it is not known for certain if they are located on the sliding deck, the radiation source, or on one of the arms. Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 12, there is lack of antecedence for "the display device". Also, "the remote control" should be "the remote control device." Appropriate correction is required.

5. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 3, there is lack of antecedence for "the output shaft". Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 4, there is lack of antecedence for "the rail". Appropriate correction is required.

7. Claim 17 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 3, there is lack of antecedence for "the output shaft". Appropriate correction is required.

8. Claim 17 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 4, there is lack of antecedence for "the rail". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 9, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang et al. (USPN 6,920,197 B2) in view of Eiler (USPN 6,058,158) and Lowman (USPN 6,763,635 B1).

11. With respect to claim 9, Kang et al. disclose a combined mobile container inspection system, comprising: a radiation source (located within 6); a chassis (2); a rotatable deck (5) provided at an end of an upper surface of said chassis and being rotatable with respect to said chassis, provided with a parallelogram bracket (8) formed by a hingedly-connected four-bar linkage mechanism, wherein a cross link of the parallelogram bracket extends to form a horizontal cross arm (9) with detectors, an end of said horizontal cross arm being connected with a vertical upright arm (10) that can be vertical or parallel to said horizontal cross arm. Kang et al. disclose all of the elements except for a sliding deck provided at the rear end of the rotatable deck and movable upwardly and downwardly, said sliding deck is provided, in turn, with the radiation source, the X-ray generated therefrom being in the face of the detectors provided in the horizontal cross arm and vertical upright arm, with a calibrator, and with a collimator.

Eiler discloses an x-ray examination device with x-ray equipment support (22) that supports the radiation source (13) that can be raised and lowered in the directions

of the double arrows shown in Figure 5 (column 5, lines 55-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kang et al. to have the third box-shaped cabin (6), which contains the radiation source, slideable up and down, to enable positioning of the x-ray source, as taught by Eiler.

Kang et al. and Eiler are silent as to a calibrator and collimator, but these are well known devices to use with an X-ray source for testing and directing purposes. Lowman discloses use of a collimator (113) for directing the X-rays emitted from the emitter (112). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Kang et al. to include a calibrator and a collimator with the radiation source, to provide for testing and directing of the emitted x-ray beam.

12. With respect to claim 15, Kang et al. disclose wheels (see Fig. 1A) provided with a driving device (4) are mounted on a lower surface of said chassis (2).

13. With respect to claim 17, Kang et al. disclose said driving device has a hydraulic pressure motor which is fixed to the lower surface of the chassis, the output shaft of the hydraulic pressure motor being connected with the wheels directly provided on the rail or directly contacting the ground surface (column 4, lines 19-29).

14. Claims 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang et al. (USPN 6,920,197 B2) in view of Eiler (USPN 6,058,158) and Lowman (USPN 6,763,635 B1) as applied to claims 9 and 15 above, and further in view of Franke (USPN 3,565,218).

15. With respect to claim 16, Kang et al. in view of Eiler and Lowman do not disclose said driving device comprises a motor and a decelerator which are fixed with the lower surface of the chassis, and a motor shaft is connected with the decelerator, the output shaft of which is connected with the wheels directly provided on the rail or directly contacting the ground surface. Franke discloses this (column 3, line 65 - column 4, line 52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Kang et al./Eiler/Lowman to have a motor and a decelerator which are fixed with the lower surface of the chassis, and a motor shaft is connected with the decelerator, the output shaft of which is connected with the wheels directly provided on the rail or directly contacting the ground surface, to eliminate relative motion and to provide a minimal amount of power losses due to friction in the decelerator, as taught by Franke.

16. With respect to claim 18, Kang et al. disclose said radiation source is a linear electron accelerator or a radioactive isotope (column 5, lines 10-12).

Allowable Subject Matter

17. Claims 10-14 and 19-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Prior art fails to disclose a combined mobile container inspection system, comprising a radiation source, a chassis, a rotatable deck provided with a parallelogram bracket formed by a hingedly-connected four-bar linkage mechanism, a horizontal cross

arm with detectors, a vertical upright arm, and a sliding deck, wherein an auxiliary bracket of the vertical upright arm is provided on the upper surface of the chassis corresponding to an end of the rotatable deck when the vertical upright arm is supported parallel to the horizontal cross arm, as claimed in claim 10.

Prior art fails to disclose a combined mobile container inspection system, comprising a radiation source, a chassis, a rotatable deck provided with a parallelogram bracket formed by a hingedly-connected four-bar linkage mechanism, a horizontal cross arm with detectors, a vertical upright arm, and a sliding deck, wherein a middle part of the upper surface of the chassis is provided with a device cabin, in which an image acquisition module, an operation inspection device and a modulator cabin are provided, as claimed in claim 11. Claims 12-14 are allowable due to their dependency on claim 11.

Prior art fails to disclose a combined mobile container inspection system, comprising a radiation source, a chassis, a rotatable deck provided with a parallelogram bracket formed by a hingedly-connected four-bar linkage mechanism, a horizontal cross arm with detectors, a vertical upright arm, and a sliding deck, wherein said sliding deck is comprised, in two parts, of a fixed frame and a sliding frame provided with the radiation source, calibrator and collimator, the fixed frame is fixed to the rotatable deck, both ends of the inner side of the fixed frame are provided with sliding rail, the sliding frame is embeddedly provided on the sliding rail of the fixed frame, and a driving mechanism, which moves the sliding frame upwardly and downwardly, is connected

between the fixed frame and the sliding frame, as claimed in claim 19. Claims 20 and 21 are allowable due to their dependency on claim 19.

Conclusion

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jurie Yun whose telephone number is 571 272-2497.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ed Glick can be reached on 571 272-2490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Jurie Yun
Examiner
Art Unit 2882

May 27, 2007